

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

An attempt has been made to address each of the Examiner's points in the order they were raised in the Office Action of 16 April 2007:

OBJECTIONS

Objections to Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because the drawing of "said second frame is removable connected to the first frame", as set forth in Claim 8, is not shown. Referring to the specification at p. 8, lns. 3 – 5, the structure is recited as follows: "[f]or attaching the second frame 42 to the first frame 7 a bolted joint or similar arrangement is preferred."

According to 37 CFR 1.83(a), "conventional features disclosed in the description and claims, where their detailed illustration is not essential for a proper understanding of the invention, should be illustrated in the drawing in the form of a graphical drawing symbol or a labeled representation (e.g. a labeled rectangular box)."

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that a "bolted joint or similar arrangement" is a conventional way to removably attach the second frame to the first frame and a drawing of a bolted joint or similar arrangement is not essential for a proper understanding of the invention. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's Objection to the Drawings should be withdrawn.

Objections to Claims

The Examiner has objected to Claim 8 on the grounds that "the said second frame" is confusing and appears to be a typo error. The word "said" has been deleted. Furthermore, the words "removable" and "adjustable" in line 7 of Claim 8 are adverbs and modify the term "connected". As such, they have been amended to read "removably" and "adjustably" in order to conform with generally accepted rules of grammar.

Objections to Specification

The Examiner has objected to the specification under 37 CFR 1.71 as not clearly describing the subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner claims that the specification "does not clearly disclose how the

second frame is removably attached to the first frame.” Further, the Examiner has stated that the specification “does not clearly describe how the structure of the interconnection section is arranged in order to make the adjustments.”

In response, the Examiner’s attention is drawn to page 8, lines 3 – 5 of the specification, wherein the inventor has stated: “For attaching the second frame 42 to the first frame 17 a bolted joint or similar arrangement is preferred.” It is respectfully submitted that the manner of attachment is known is a conventional feature known in the art and the various ways to removably and adjustably connect two calendaring frames, at the “interconnection section”, is readily apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art.

REJECTIONS

Claim rejections under 35 USC §112

The Examiner has rejected claims 8 – 10 and 15 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. It is respectfully submitted that the reference to “bolted joints or similar arrangements” on page 8, lines 3 –5 of the specification provides ample explanation to those of ordinary skill in the art to enable them to practice the invention.

Claim 9 was further rejected as being indefinite due to the lack of antecedent basis for the three orthogonal directions, x, y and z. The claim has been amended to remove this lack of clarity.

Claim rejections under 35 USC §102

Claim 1 has been canceled.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s rejections of claims 8-10 and 15 as being anticipated by Patent No. 6,688,218 to Svenka, et. al. (“Svenka”) are unsupported. Contrary to the Examiner’s assertions, Svenka does not disclose a movable or adjustable second frame. In fact, there is only one frame (13) disclosed in Svenka. Col 3, ln. 35. Figure 3 of Svenka does not show a stack of rolls being adjustable and moveable compared to a second stack; rather, it shows one stack of rolls in an elevated position relative to the other stack, with both stacks being attached to the same frame (13), in order to reduce the distance traveled by the web between the first stack and the second stack. Col 4, lns. 6-18. Further, the hydraulic cylinder (19) shown in Figure 3 does not move one stack relative to the other stack; rather, it controls the pressure between the rolls on the stack to which it is attached. The uppermost

Appl. No.: 10/533,000
Docket No.: DB001177-000
Amdt. Dated: 10 October 2007
Reply to Office action of 16 April 2007

roll is fixed to the frame so it is stationary. Col 3, Ins. 39-43. As such, Svenka does not anticipate claims 8-10 or 15 and the Examiner's reconsideration is earnestly requested.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to respond to the Office Action and to place the claims in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance for claims 8-10 and 15 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Carl A. Ronald
Reg. No. 43,057
Thorp Reed & Armstrong, LLP
One Oxford Centre
301 Grant Street, 14th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
(412) 394-7775

Dated: 10 October 2007

Attorneys for Applicant